



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,389	08/15/2001	Kishore M.N.	MS1-926US	1581
22801	7590	11/01/2005		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,389

Applicant(s)

M.N. ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 8/19/05.
2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application; and, claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 18 are independent claims. Claims 7 and 11 have been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gayraud et al. ("Gayraud") in view of Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week ("HTML").

As per claim 7, although Gayraud teaches a method comprising receiving a GUI comprising a GUI parent having GUI children, the GUI children having positions within the GUI parent (figs. 3A, 4A-5E and 8; col. 8, lines 39-40) and dividing the GUI parent into sectors based on the positions of the GUI children within the GUI parent (col. 8, lines 24-33), Gayraud does not explicitly disclose dividing a GUI parent into container level sectors. HTML teaches dividing a GUI parent into container level sectors (pages 342-362). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include HTML's teaching of dividing a GUI parent into container level sectors to Gayraud's teaching of dividing a GUI parent into sectors in order to provide users with a single screen consisting of a number of separate content/documents.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 8/19/05.
2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application; and, claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 18 are independent claims. Claims 7 and 11 have been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gayraud et al. ("Gayraud") in view of Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week ("HTML").

As per claim 7, although Gayraud teaches a method comprising receiving a GUI comprising a GUI parent having GUI children, the GUI children having positions within the GUI parent (figs. 3A, 4A-5E and 8; col. 8, lines 39-40) and dividing the GUI parent into sectors based on the positions of the GUI children within the GUI parent (col. 8, lines 24-33), Gayraud does not explicitly disclose dividing a GUI parent into container level sectors. HTML teaches dividing a GUI parent into container level sectors (pages 342-362). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include HTML's teaching of dividing a GUI parent into container level sectors to Gayraud's teaching of dividing a GUI parent into sectors in order to provide users with a single screen consisting of a number of separate content/documents.

As per claim 8, the modified Gayraud teaches a method wherein each sector includes at least one of the GUI children (Gayraud: fig. 8; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60).

As per claim 9, the modified Gayraud teaches a method comprising mapping each of the GUI children to at least one of the sectors (Gayraud: fig. 8; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60; *each bit is mapped to a pixel on the display*).

As per claim 10, the modified Gayraud teaches a method comprising linking a cursor to one of the GUI children using the mapping (Gayraud: col. 8, lines 24-33; col. 9, lines 16-26; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60).

Claims 1-6 and 11 are individually similar in scope to the combination of claims 9 and 10 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, Gayraud teaches a method comprising dividing a GUI parent having GUI children into sectors (col. 8, lines 24-33), mapping each of the GUI children to at least one of the sectors (fig. 8; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60), linking a cursor to one of the GUI children using the mapping (col. 8, lines 24-33; col. 9, lines 16-26; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60) and painting one of the GUI children based on the linking (col. 3, lines 29-44; col. 7, lines 8-11).

5. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gayraud et al. ("Gayraud") in view of Thompson et al. ("Thompson").

As per claim 12, although Gayraud teaches a method comprising dividing a GUI parent associated with an operating system into operating system sectors (fig. 1B; col. 5, lines 15-36; col. 8, lines 24-27 and 49-57; *the client area associated with an operating*

system may be divided into sectors) and dividing a GUI parent associated with other applications and/or operating systems into sectors (figs. 1(B-C); col. 8, lines 24-42; col. 8, line 62 through col. 9, line 3), Gayraud does not explicitly disclose the other applications and/or operating systems to be a framework. Thompson teaches the use of hit testing in a framework (sections [0040], [0060], [0078], [0097] and [0099]). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Thompson's use of hit testing in a framework to Gayraud use of hit testing in an operating system in order to provide users in order to track users' cursor movements.

As per claim 13, the modified Gayraud teaches a method wherein the GUI parent associated with a framework comprises GUI children (Gayraud: col. 8, lines 24-42; col. 8, line 62 through col. 9, line 3).

As per claim 14, the modified Gayraud teaches a method comprising mapping each of the GUI children to at least one of the framework sectors (Gayraud: fig. 8; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60).

As per claim 15, the modified Gayraud teaches a method comprising linking a cursor to one of the GUI children using the mapping (Gayraud: col. 8, lines 24-33; col. 9, lines 16-26; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60).

As per claim 16, the modified Gayraud teaches a method comprising creating a map that maps operating system sectors to the operating system and maps framework sectors to the framework (Gayraud: fig. 8; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60).

As per claim 17, the modified Gayraud teaches a method wherein the map includes information related to GUI children (Gayraud: fig. 8; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60; *each bit is mapped to a pixel on the display*).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 12 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, except for the following:

Gayraud does not disclose sectors, mapping a GUI child to at least one sector or linking a cursor to a GUI child using the mapping.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Gayraud does teach regions/sectors (figs. 3A, 4A-5E and 8; col. 8, lines 24-40), mapping a GUI child to at least one region/sector (fig. 8; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60; *i.e. each bit of the GUI child is mapped to a pixel on the display*) and linking a cursor to a GUI child using the mapping (col. 8, lines 24-33; col. 9, lines 16-26; col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 60; *cursor movement is tracked*). If by "sector" applicant meant a portion of the data storage area on a disk and by "mapping" applicant meant creating a map file, applicant is invited to amend the claims to include such claim language.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §

706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Inquires

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
October 23, 2005

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100